

SEP 26 2006

Application No. 10/763,797
Filed January 23, 2004
Page 7 of 8

REMARKS

After entry of the foregoing amendments, claims 1-9, 12, 13, 19 and 20 are pending. Claim 11 was cancelled. Claims 1-7 are indicated as allowed. Reconsideration of this patent application in view of the above amendments and the following remarks is respectfully requested.

Rejection under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph:

In the Final Office Action, the Examiner rejected claims 8, 11, 12, and 13 under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regard as the invention. More specifically, the examiner pointed out that the "pivot tube end" (Claim 8, line 4) lacks antecedent basis in the claim and that it was not presented in the earlier version of claim 8. In response, Applicant removed the recitation of the "pivot tube end" to restore claim 8 to its original condition. Applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner withdraws this ground for rejection in view of this correction.

Rejection under 35 U.S.C. 103(a):

The examiner also rejected claims 8, 9, and 13 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 5,163,527 to Eveleth ("Eveleth"). Claims 11 and 12 were objected to, but deemed allowable if re-written in independent form. In response, the Applicant amended claims 8 and 12 and canceled claim 11.

In accordance with the Examiner's suggestion, claim 8 was amended to include the description of specific structure for a means for locking the power output shaft to prevent rotation of the power output shaft that was previously recited in claim 11. Since claim 11 was not rejected as being obvious in light of Eveleth, the current amendment renders independent claim 8 not obvious in light of Eveleth as well. Claims 9 and 13 are also patentable over Eveleth because they are dependent on claim 8. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner withdraws this ground for rejection.

LV1 429889v1 09/26/06

SEP 26 2006

Application No. 10/763,797
Filed January 23, 2004
Page 8 of 8

New Claims 19-20:

Applicant added claims 19 and 20 dependent on claim 12. In the Final Office Action, the Examiner indicated that claim 12 will be allowed if re-written in the independent form. Claim 12 has been re-written to include all of the limitations of the base claim (claim 8) as suggested by the Examiner and, thus, is patentable over Eveleth. New claims 19 and 20 correspond to the limitations recited in claims 9 and 13 respectively. Accordingly, the Applicant respectfully requests that claims 12, 19 and 20 be allowed.

CONCLUSION:

Applicant respectfully submits that all the claims are in condition for allowance and Applicant respectfully requests that all claims be allowed.

Applicant requests that any questions concerning this matter be directed to the undersigned at (609) 895-6639. If a telephone conference would be of assistance in advancing the prosecution of the present application, Applicant's undersigned attorney invites the Examiner to telephone at the number provided.

Applicant also authorizes the charge of any deficiency and/or the credit of any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 50-1943.

Respectfully submitted,



Date: September 26, 2006

John P. Blasko
Registration No. 31,149
Customer No. 29880
Attorney for Applicant
FOX, ROTHSCHILD LLP
Princeton Pike Corporate Center
997 Lenox Drive, Building 3
Lawrenceville, NJ 08648
Ph: (609) 895.6639
Fax (609) 896.1469

LV1 429889v1 09/26/06